



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,184	10/30/2000	Alphonsus Albertus Schirris	37386-165312	3561
26694	7590	07/12/2004	EXAMINER	
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			ABEBE, DANIEL DEMELASH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2655	8
DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/698,184	SCHIRRIS, ALPHONSUS ALBERTUS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel D Abebe	2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 21-28 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.7.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

Election/Restrictions

During a telephone conversation with Ralph Albreeht on 6/30/2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group one, claims 1-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 21-28 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is requested to send a copy of the IDS and that was filed on January 7/2002 (paper No.6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 10 and 12, 13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Poznanski et al. (6,389,387).

As to claim 8, Poznanski teaches a method of retrieving documents in a multi language information retrieval system, comprising the steps of:

Receiving a database comprising a plurality of documents;

Identifying search terms;

Translating the search term into linguistically related terms including synonyms and different languages;

Forming for each translated terms indexing feature (analogous to the UID); and

Storing the index and the corresponding documents in storage medium for search (Col.3, lines 3-18; Figs.1-3).

Claims 13 and 14 are analogous to claim 1, and are rejected for the foregoing reasons by Poznanski.

As to claims 2-6, Poznanski teaches indexing (identifying documents by code) and where the term comprises documents and data and where the language includes plurality of languages (Col.3, line 5-Col.4, lines 20).

As to claim 10, Poznanski teaches where the index database stored as multi-language dictionary (Fig.1).

As to claim 12, Poznanski inherently teaches where the system could be networked.

As to claim 18, Poznanski teaches where the system comprises a plurality of databases (Fig.1).

As to claim 19, Mccarley teaches indexing a translated term including a synonym (Col.4, line 10-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9, 11, 15-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poznanski and in view of Mccarley (6,349,276).

With regard to claim 8, Poznanski doesn't explicitly teach the information retrieval part, however, Mccarley teaches a method (Fig.4) of retrieving documents in a cross language information retrieval (CLIR) system, comprising the steps of:

Translating (210) a document

indexing the translated data (212);

Receiving a multi-lingual query from a user (102);

Parsing/filtering (204) the multi-lingual query;

searching (214) and retrieving the corresponding documents; and

Providing the list of documents to the user (216). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of skilled in the art to combine the two arts as part of accessing the required document using multiple language.

Claims 15-17 and 20 are analogous to claims 8 and are rejected for the foregoing reasons by Poznanski in view of Mccarley.

As to claim 9, Mccarley teaches where search terms are analyzed (Col.6 ,lines 60-62).

Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarley.

As to claims 7, 11 Official Notice is taken that the global yellow page directory is a well known tool for accessing information globally and would be obvious in Poznanski and Mccarley' cross language database service for providing service such as directory assistance in different languages.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D Abebe whose telephone number is 703-308-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 703-305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Abebe, A.U. 2655



7/1/2004